



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

chaplain for the Penitentiary should not have been laid entirely at the door of the Presbyterians. While the works of Dr. James and Dr. Thom are distinct contributions, it is to be regretted that they did not give a full explanation of the vestry laws and the connection of the Church with the State, and that the popular feeling with reference to the different denominations has been so little emphasized. But by far the most serious fault is the fact that the Journals of the General Assembly have been quoted over and over again, which allude to certain petitions, resolutions and bills, while no reference has been made to such of these petitions, etc., as exist. The bottom of the matter has not been reached. It is true that many of the petitions, resolutions and proposed bills have been lost, but it is also true that many of them are preserved in the State Library in MS. form. We can have no "documentary history" so long as many of the real documents have remained untouched. Though Dr. James and Dr. Thom have handled, on the whole, faithfully and well the materials which they have had, with so much still in MS. and unexamined, a full and complete history of the efforts for and against religious liberty in Virginia is yet to be written.

THE TRANSIT OF CIVILIZATION FROM ENGLAND TO AMERICA IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. By Edward Eggleston, author of the *Beginners of a Nation*. New York. D. Appleton & Co., 1901, pp. viii, 344.

In taking up a new subject, on which he has written a most interesting, and, in many respects, valuable book, Mr. Eggleston states the obstacles in his way. He found little in America, and nothing in England to aid him. "It became necessary to build from the ground." In accomplishing this work one would suppose that he would not only have made use of all information that is in print, but, for America, would have gone to the best sources, our manuscript records. How widely he has used books is shown on every page of his history. What use he made of unpublished manuscripts, at least as far as Virginia is concerned, will be referred to later.

One of the first things which strikes the reader, and the impression remains with him to the end, is the harsh and unsympathetic way in which the subject is treated. We learn of the bigotry, the superstition, the ignorance and the brutality of the people of the seventeenth century, and we learn of little else.

From the summary in the preface, we have what the author sees in the century of which he writes:

"The little world as seen by the man of the seventeenth century must be understood. Its sun, moon and planets were flames of fire without gravity, revolved about the earth by countless angels; its God governed this one little world with mock majesty. Its heaven, its horrible hell of material fire, blown by the mouth of God, its chained de-

mons whose fetters might be loosed, its damnation of infants, were to be appreciated and expounded. The inhumanity of punishments and of sport of that day, the mixture made of religion and revenge—these, and a hundred other things went to make up the traits of the century."

All these may have been part of the seventeenth century, but they were not all—there was much else, much that was higher and better, which it would seem would have caught the eye of the historian, taking his first glance over the period.

A typical instance of the lack of sympathetic feeling is shown in his first remark on the memorable phrase in the Massachusetts school law of 1647, providing for a school when any township had increased to fifty householders, which is that "this *ungrammatical* (italics ours) sentence is the vital part of the law." An explorer standing by the tiniest upper waters of the Nile, might as well remark on what an ugly little quagmire it was, rather than feel reverence in his heart for the trickling stream because in its lower course it became such a renowned and life giving river. But Mr. Eggleston does not believe in such a continuity. He says in his preface: "We cannot make out in the seventeenth century the great destiny of Virginia in the eighteenth. We must not be sure that the future greatness of New England is wrapped up in the peculiarly narrow and forbidding husk of the later seventeenth century." Leaving New Englanders to speak for themselves, it seems a most evident fact that Virginia of the eighteenth century was surely the product of Virginia of the seventeenth. The growth was slow indeed, and there was great improvement in the first named century, but the main fabric was evolved directly from the humble beginnings in the seventeenth.

In another place he says that it would be misleading to suppose that the intellectual life of England as represented by Jonson and Shakespeare, had any influence on the colonists of Jamestown, or that by Milton on the emigrant to New England. To a large extent this was doubtless true, but the spirit of an age manifests itself in many different ways. May there not have been something of that "impulse of potent genius, prescient of momentous truths that still lay slumbering in the bosom of futurity," caught from Shakespeare by his dear friend Southampton, which gave the Virginia Company during his administration, the freedom of spirit that made James deem it a "seminary of sedition," and gave to Virginia its legislature. ? And is it hard to believe that some of the greatness of Puritanism, which made Milton what he was, could be found in the best of the New England leaders. ?

But now to confine ourselves to the portions of Mr. Eggleston's book which treat of Virginia. Reference has been made to the necessity in the preparation of such a work as this of recourse to manuscript sources. At the present day this has become an axiom. And the vital objection to many of his statements in regard to Virginia is that he has not sufficient information. There have been so very many more publications in

regard to New England than Virginia, that possibly sufficient information may be found in print to equip a writer for this work as regards the colonies of that section. But one might read everything which has been published concerning Virginia (as Mr. Eggleston appears to have done), and then not be qualified to write a history of civilization in Virginia in the seventeenth century.

Only an exhaustive, patient and laborious examination of the county records, such as that made by Mr. Bruce for his "Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century," will enable one to give anything like an accurate account. Mr. Bruce, by the way (whose book is nowhere quoted by Mr. Eggleston), it is understood, is engaged on a work treating of the same subjects as "The Transit of Civilization." It will be curious to compare them.

The records, which are, for Virginia, the chief sources of information in regard to the matters discussed in Mr. Eggleston's book, are the records of our counties, and, unfortunately, none of them have been printed. The only manuscripts relating to Virginia which are referred to by the author, are copies of some of the county records now in the Virginia State Library. He cites of these, the Accomac records (two volumes of the earliest period), and those of York and Surry (there are also only two volumes of the last named county). He has also used the "Smith of Nibley MSS.," New York Public Library, which refer to the affairs of one plantation; the Randolph MS., Va. Historical Society, a manuscript narrative by George Donne, and the MS. records of the Virginia Company, in Washington. He has used the parish registers at the Virginia Episcopal Theological Seminary, and as practically all of them are deposited there, he has of course obtained all the information they contain in regard to the operations of the vestrys.

But those who have studied social conditions in Virginia, as shown in the county records, know that it is impossible for any one who has not made a more thorough study than Mr. Eggleston's references and notes show him to have done, to speak positively or with precision of the state of civilization here during the seventeenth century.

While demanding this much from the historian, it is only proper to say that the critic who attempts a complete and exhaustive examination or reply, should have a similar equipment of historic information. Therefore, no such criticism will be attempted here. Attention may, however, be called to several points.

The statement made on pages 158-59, expresses a common opinion, but one, it is fully believed, based on misinformation, and lack of information: "After the passing of Hunt and Whittaker and other brave missionaries of the first generation, there came a different race of clergymen, 'such as wore black Coats, and could babble in a Pulpit, roar in a tavern \* \* \* and rather by their dissoluteness, destroy, than feed their flocks.' The church was far away, the parson contemptible, but

no doubt some of the isolated settlers resorted to service to meet their neighbors and relieve the tedium of loneliness. But many of the young Virginians, and those of a rougher class, generally preferred to spend the idle day of the week at the nearest Indian village, in rude amusements and intercourse with the barbarians." Instead of this state of affairs, it is believed there is little doubt that the majority of the people of Virginia attended church regularly, whenever they had an opportunity or the great distance of the church did not forbid. When they did not, the grand juries of their counties soon had to know the reason.

It is indeed time that historical writers ceased repeating, without investigation as to the truth, the hackneyed old stories of the dissoluteness of the Virginia colonial clergy. Let anyone take all the names of the ministers he can find, and then examine all records and printed accounts for what is said about them, pro and con, and he will discover very different conditions from those which have too commonly been assumed to be the true ones. There were bad men among the clergy of Virginia, of course; but they were not in the majority.

And in regard to spending Sunday "in the nearest Indian village." Mr. Eggleston evidently thinks there was such a village within easy walk of every farm and plantation. After the massacre of 1644 and the reprisals which followed, there were only a few feeble little settlements of the natives scattered throughout the whole of the inhabited parts of the colony. Whatever the mass of Virginians did on Sunday, they did not spend it at Indian villages.

Again, he says (p. 159) that "throughout the colonial period the Virginia Sunday was never a rigorous Sabbath, but mainly a day of leisure, of sport and social enjoyment, with resort to church service when convenient." This is to a considerable extent correct, but though the Virginia Sunday never had the gloom and severity of the New England Sabbath, and was a day of pleasant social gatherings, chiefly, no doubt, like what were later called "dining days," yet attendance at church was general and there was stringent legislation to enforce it.

On page 175 the author again refers to the "tavern haunting, brawling and sometimes almost criminal parsons," as if this was the type of the clergymen of the period. A great service will be rendered to the truth of history when some careful investigator shows us what really were the facts in regard to the colonial church.

On page 184, in referring to the Bishop of London's reprehension of the custom of burying in gardens, and of accepting marriage from men not ordained, Mr. Eggleston prints a statement in regard to Virginia, which it would seem no writer would make in regard to any colony, unless after the most thorough and searching investigation of all evidences and conviction beyond a shadow of a doubt of its accuracy. He says: "There were things in the colony infinitely worse than the graveyard at the back of the garden. \* \* \* But to Bishop Comp-

ton ecclesiastical impropriety \* \* \* was a sin more heinous than oppression of bondsmen and unregulated morals." Two pamphlets "and many others" do not constitute sufficient evidence to produce such a charge. We might compare the morals of Virginia with those of New England, as shown by the records of both, and not fear the comparison; but such manner of defense is odious at all times, and especially when New England is included in the sweeping criticism of all the colonies. All that is needed for Virginia is for the truth as found in our records to be told. What this shows we are content to abide by.

The last of the statements which will be noticed, and which shows most plainly Mr. Eggleston's lack of proper information, is that made on page 296, where he states that "almost all the emigrants that came [to Va.] between 1620 and 1650 were bondsmen." It is evident to all that nothing but the most minute, extensive and laborious research would enable one to make any statement as to the number of people of various classes who came to Virginia between the dates named. If Mr. Eggleston had taken "Hotten's Emigrants;" had examined and made a list of all names appearing in the land patents, and was familiar with all the extant county records of this period, he would have been as well equipped as one can now be to judge in regard to the number and character of the immigrants. The writer does not claim to have done this, but a fair test can be made from the abstracts of patents which have been published in this Magazine.

From 1623 to July 14, 1637, five hundred and one patents were issued (on record in the present books). Of the names appearing in these patents, 336 are positively known to have come to the colony as freemen and were chiefly men and heads of families. There are 245 persons whose names do not occur as head-rights and yet of whom it is not positively shown that they were freemen, though the probability seems to be that by far the greater number of them were. And there were 2094 persons whose transportation charges were paid by others. This last number includes some negroes, all those specifically termed "servants," and all others. It is well known that emigrants coming to Virginia included their wives, children, relations and friends who came with them among the head-rights to their patents, and all these are included in the number of persons whose transportation was paid by others. Again, there were freemen who came to Virginia, and who afterwards, sometimes many years afterwards, sold their "head-right," or title to 50 acres. All such will appear in this largest number given. Of course no one denies that there were very many "bondsmen" or indentured servants brought to Virginia, but nothing could be more mistaken than to say that they constituted practically all the emigrants to Virginia between 1620 and 1650. It would probably be a fair estimate to say that of the names represented in the patents cited, there were about 675 free men,

women and children who came to Virginia and about 2,000 servants and slaves.

It is not an agreeable task to have to criticise such a book as this, which, as has been said, is full of interest and of information. Especially may the chapter on education during the seventeenth century be commended as the best treatment of the subject which has appeared.

PAUL JONES, FOUNDER OF THE AMERICAN NAVY. A history. By Augustus C. Buell. In two volumes. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York, 1900. Pp. xv, 328; 373.

Great as are the merits of Mr. Buell's life of Paul Jones (and they have been generally recognized), it would have added much to the satisfaction of the student if he had been more explicit as to his authorities, especially those in manuscript. It may be satisfactory to the author to content himself by saying that Jones' papers were divided after his death, and to tell into whose hands they fell, but it is not altogether so to the reader. An author may cite, with verbal correctness, and yet a knowledge of the character of the sources of his information may greatly effect one's opinion of its value.

Paul Jones' life in Virginia, is, of course, a minor matter in his remarkable career, but we, here in Virginia, are interested in it, and wish to be exact as to details.

Mr. Buell states in the beginning of the life, that it was usual for ships making the voyage to and fro, between England and Virginia, to make a triangular trip, taking in the West Indies. In numerous letters of Virginia shippers which have been examined, there is nothing to confirm this. On the contrary, the writer has seen no reference to such a method of making the voyage.

Mr. Buell states that on John Paul's first voyage he dropped anchor in the Rappahannock river, "near the present site of the sleepy old Virginia village of Urbanna." Urbanna, by the way, was, for Virginia, quite an old village at the date of this voyage, 1759. But this is only worth noting because Mr. Buell states that the plantation of William Jones, who had adopted William, John Paul's brother, was only a short distance away, thus making it in the county of Middlesex. All other accounts have located the residence of this brother William in Spotsylvania county, which is at the head of navigation on the Rappahannock, and with the counties of Essex and Caroline, and part of Middlesex intervening between it and Urbanna.

Again we should be glad to know what and where is the "quaint old colonial record"—a will, which Mr. Buell mentions on pages 15 and 16. The terms, as given, are unlike the usual colonial will, and a man who owned 3,000 acres on the Rappahannock, a mansion house, mill, &c., thirty negroes, twenty horses and colts, and eighty cattle, was above the usual wealth, and his light could by no means have been hid under